Another Generalisation of the Reed-Muller Codes

Cunsheng Ding, Chunlei Li, and Yongbo Xia

arXiv:1605.03796v2 [cs.IT] 1 Jan 2017

Abstract

The punctured binary Reed-Muller code is cyclic and was generalised into the punctured generalised Reed-Muller code over GF(q) in the literature. The major objective of this paper is to present another generalisation of the punctured binary Reed-Muller code and the binary Reed-Muller code, and analyse these codes. We will prove that this newly generalised Reed-Muller code is affine-invariant and holds 2-designs. Another objective is to construct a family of reversible cyclic codes that are related to the newly generalised Reed-Muller codes.

Index Terms

BCH codes, cyclic codes, linear codes, punctured Reed-Muller codes, punctured generalised Reed-Muller codes, Reed-Muller codes.

I. Introduction

Throughout this paper, let p be a prime and let $q = p^s$ be a power of p, where s is a positive integer. An $[n,k,d]$ code $\mathcal{C}$ over GF(q) is a k-dimensional subspace of GF$(q)^n$ with minimum (Hamming) distance d.

An $[n,k]$ code $\mathcal{C}$ over GF(q) is called *cyclic* if $(c_0,c_1,\cdots,c_{n-1}) \in \mathcal{C}$ implies $(c_{n-1},c_0,c_1,\cdots,c_{n-2}) \in \mathcal{C}$. By identifying any vector $(c_0,c_1,\cdots,c_{n-1}) \in \mathrm{GF}(q)^n$ with

$$c_0 + c_1 x + c_2 x^2 + \cdots + c_{n-1} x^{n-1} \in \mathrm{GF}(q)[x]/(x^n-1),$$

any code $\mathcal{C}$ of length n over GF(q) corresponds to a subset of the quotient ring GF$(q)[x]/(x^n-1)$. A linear code $\mathcal{C}$ is cyclic if and only if the corresponding subset in GF$(q)[x]/(x^n-1)$ is an ideal of the ring GF$(q)[x]/(x^n-1)$.

Note that every ideal of GF$(q)[x]/(x^n-1)$ is principal. Let $\mathcal{C} = \langle g(x) \rangle$ be a cyclic code, where $g(x)$ is monic and has the smallest degree among all the generators of $\mathcal{C}$. Then $g(x)$ is unique and called the *generator polynomial,* and $h(x) = (x^n-1)/g(x)$ is referred to as the *check polynomial* of $\mathcal{C}$.

The original Reed-Muller codes were discovered by Reed and Muller independently in 1964 [13], [14]. These codes are standard materials in textbooks and research monographs on coding theory, and were employed in space communication in the Mariner 9 Spacecraft. These facts show the importance of the Reed-Muller codes.

Recently, Reed-Muller codes have become a hot topic in coding theory due to the fact that they belong to the classes of locally testable codes and locally decodable codes, which makes them useful in the design of probabilistically checkable proofs in computational complexity theory [16].

The original Reed-Muller codes are binary and linear, but not cyclic. However, the punctured Reed-Muller codes are cyclic. The punctured binary Reed-Muller code was generalised into the punctured generalised Reed-Muller code over GF(q) in the literature [1], [2], [6], [5], [7]. In this paper, we present another generalisation of the punctured binary Reed-Muller code and the binary Reed-Muller code, and study properties of these codes. We will prove that the newly generalised Reed-Muller code is affine-invariant and holds 2-designs. We will also construct a family of reversible cyclic codes from the newly generalised Reed-Muller codes and analyse their parameters.

C. Ding's research was supported by the Hong Kong Research Grants Council, under Grant No. 16301114.

C. Ding is with the Department of Computer Science and Engineering, The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Clear Water Bay, Kowloon, Hong Kong, China (Email: cding@ust.hk).

C. Li is with the Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of Stavanger, Stavanger, 4036, Norway (Email: chunlei.li@uis.no).

Y. Xia is with the Department of Mathematics and Statistics, South-Central University for Nationalities, Wuhan 430074, China (Email: xia@mail.scuec.edu.cn).

II. q-CYCLOTOMIC COSETS MODULO n AND AUXILILARIES

To deal with cyclic codes of length n over GF(q), we have to study the canonical factorization of x^n-1 over GF(q). To this end, we need to introduce q-cyclotomic cosets modulo n. Note that x^n-1 has no repeated factors over GF(q) if and only if $\gcd(n,q)=1$. Throughout this paper, we assume that $\gcd(n,q)=1$.

Let $\mathcal{N}=\{0,1,2,\cdots,n-1\}$, denoting the ring of integers modulo n. For any $s\in\mathcal{N}$, the *q-cyclotomic coset of s modulo n* is defined by

$$C_s=\{sq^i \bmod n : 0\le i\le \ell_s-1\}\subseteq\mathcal{N},$$

where ℓ_s is the smallest positive integer such that $s\equiv sq^{\ell_s} \pmod n$, and is the size of the q-cyclotomic coset. The smallest integer in C_s is called the *coset leader* of C_s. Let $\Gamma_{(n,q)}$ be the set of all the coset leaders. We have then $C_s\cap C_t=\emptyset$ for any two distinct elements s and t in $\Gamma_{(n,q)}$, and

$$\bigcup_{s\in\Gamma_{(n,q)}} C_s=\mathcal{N}. \tag{1}$$

Hence, the distinct q-cyclotomic cosets modulo n partition $\mathcal{N}$.

Let $m=\mathrm{ord}_n(q)$, and let α be a generator of GF(q^m)*. Put $\beta=\alpha^{(q^m-1)/n}$. Then β is a primitive n-th root of unity in GF(q^m). The minimal polynomial $\mathrm{m}_s(x)$ of β^s over GF(q) is a monic polynomial of the smallest degree over GF(q) with β^s as a zero. It is now straightforward to see that this polynomial is given by

$$\mathrm{m}_s(x)=\prod_{i\in C_s}(x-\beta^i)\in \mathrm{GF}(q)[x], \tag{2}$$

which is irreducible over GF(q). It then follows from (1) that

$$x^n-1=\prod_{s\in\Gamma_{(n,q)}}\mathrm{m}_s(x) \tag{3}$$

which is the factorization of x^n-1 into irreducible factors over GF(q). This canonical factorization of x^n-1 over GF(q) is fundamental for the study of cyclic codes.

III. THE PUNCTURED GENERALISED REED-MULLER CODES OVER GF(q)

Let m be a positive integer and let $n=q^m-1$ from now on, where $q=p^s$, p is a prime and s is a positive integer. For any integer a with $0\le a\le n-1$, we have the following q-adic expansion

$$a=\sum_{j=0}^{m-1}a_jq^j,$$

where $0\le a_j\le q-1$. The q-weight of a, denoted by $\varpi(a)$, is defined by

$$\varpi(a)=\sum_{j=0}^{m-1}a_j.$$

Let α be a generator of GF(q^m)*. Let $\ell=\ell_1(q-1)+\ell_0<q(m-1)$, where $0\le\ell_0\le q-1$. The ℓ-th order *punctured generalised Reed-Muller code* $\mathtt{PGRM}_q(\ell,m)$ over GF(q) is the cyclic code of length $n=q^m-1$ with generator polynomial

$$g^R_{(q,m,\ell)}(x):=\prod_{\substack{1\le a\le n-1\\ \varpi(a)<(q-1)m-\ell}}(x-\alpha^a). \tag{4}$$

Since $\varpi(a)$ is a constant function on each q-cyclotomic coset modulo n, $g^R_{(q,m,\ell)}(x)$ is a polynomial over GF(q). By definition, $g^R_{(q,m,\ell)}(x)$ is a divisor of x^n-1.

The parameters of the punctured generalised Reed-Muller code are known and given in the following theorem [1, Theorem 5.4.1].

Theorem 1. *The code* $\mathtt{PGRM}_q(\ell,m)$ *has length* $n=q^m-1$*, dimension*

$$k=\sum_{i=0}^{\ell}\sum_{j=0}^{m}(-1)^j\binom{m}{j}\binom{i-jq+m-1}{i-jq},$$

and minimum distance

$$d=(q-\ell_0)q^{m-\ell_1-1}-1.$$

Let $\mathbf{1}=(1,1,\cdots,1)\in \mathrm{GF}(q)^n$ and

$$\mathrm{GF}(q)\mathbf{1}=\{a\mathbf{1}: a\in \mathrm{GF}(q)\}.$$

Then $\mathrm{GF}(q)\mathbf{1}$ is a subspace of $\mathrm{GF}(q)^n$ with dimension 1. A proof of the following property can be found in [2].

Theorem 2. *The dual codes* $\mathtt{PGRM}_q(\ell,m)^\perp$ *and the original ones* $\mathtt{PGRM}_q(\ell',m)$ *are related as follows:*

$$\mathtt{PGRM}_q(\ell,m)^\perp=(\mathrm{GF}(q)\mathbf{1})^\perp\cap\mathtt{PGRM}_q(m(q-1)-\ell,m).$$

When $q=2$, $\mathtt{PGRM}_q(\ell,m)$ becomes the punctured binary Reed-Muller code. Hence, $\mathtt{PGRM}_q(\ell,m)$ is indeed a generalisation of the original punctured binary Reed-Muller code. Other properties of the code $\mathtt{PGRM}_q(\ell,m)$ can be found in [1] and the book chapter [2].

The only purpose of introducing the codes $\mathtt{PGRM}_q(\ell,m)$ in this section is to show the difference between the punctured generalised Reed-Muller codes $\mathtt{PGRM}_q(\ell,m)$ and the new family of generalised Reed-Muller codes to be introduced in the next section.

IV. Another generalisation of the punctured binary Reed-Muller codes

A. The newly generalised codes $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$

Let m be a positive integer and let $n=q^m-1$, where $q=p^s$, p is a prime and s is a positive integer. For any integer a with $0\le a\le n-1$, we have the following q-adic expansion

$$a=\sum_{j=0}^{m-1}a_jq^j,$$

where $0\le a_j\le q-1$. The Hamming weight of a, denoted by $\mathrm{wt}(a)$, is the the number of nonzero coordinates in the vector $(a_0,a_1,\cdots,a_{m-1})$.

Let α be a generator of $\mathrm{GF}(q^m)^*$. For any $1\le h\le m$, we define a polynomial

$$g_{(q,m,h)}(x)=\prod_{\substack{1\le a\le n-1\\ 1\le \mathrm{wt}(a)\le h}}(x-\alpha^a). \tag{5}$$

Since $\mathrm{wt}(a)$ is a constant function on each q-cyclotomic coset modulo n, $g_{(q,m,h)}(x)$ is a polynomial over $\mathrm{GF}(q)$. By definition, $g_{(q,m,h)}(x)$ is a divisor of x^n-1.

Let $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$ denote the cyclic code over $\mathrm{GF}(q)$ with length n and generator polynomial $g_{(m,q,h)}(x)$. By definition, $g_{(q,m,m)}(x)=(x^n-1)/(x-1)$. Therefore, the code $\mathcal{U}(q,m,m)$ is trivial. Below we consider the code $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$ for $1\le h\le m-1$ only.

To analyse this code, we set

$$I(q,m,h)=\{1\le a\le n-1: 1\le \mathrm{wt}(a)\le h\}. \tag{6}$$

The dimension of the code $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$ is equal to $n-|I(q,m,h)|$.

Theorem 3. *Let $m \geq 2$ and $1 \leq h \leq m-1$. Then $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$ has parameters $[q^m-1,k,d]$, where*

$$k = q^m - \sum_{i=0}^{h} \binom{m}{i} (q-1)^i.$$

and

$$\frac{q^{h+1}-1}{q-1} \leq d \leq 2q^h - 1. \tag{7}$$

Proof: As shown earlier, $I(q,m,h)$ is the union of some q-cyclotomic cosets modulo n. The total number of elements in $\mathcal{N}$ with Hamming weight i is equal to $\binom{m}{i}(q-1)^i$. It then follows that

$$|I(q,m,h)| = \sum_{i=1}^{h} \binom{m}{i} (q-1)^i.$$

Hence, the dimension k of the code is given by

$$k = q^m - 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{h} \binom{m}{i} (q-1)^i.$$

Note that every integer a with $1 \leq a \leq (q^{h+1}-1)/(q-1)-1$ has Hamming weight $\mathrm{wt}(a) \leq h$. By definition,

$$\left\{1,2,3,\cdots,(q^{h+1}-1)/(q-1)-1\right\} \subset I(q,m,h).$$

It then follows from the BCH bound that $d \geq (q^{h+1}-1)/(q-1)$.

We now prove the upper bound on the minimum distance d given in (7). Define

$$\ell = (m-h)(q-1)-1 = (q-1)(m-h-1)+q-2 = (q-1)\ell_1 + \ell_0,$$

where $\ell_1 = m-h-1$ and $\ell_0 = q-2$. If $1 \leq a \leq n-1$ and $\mathrm{wt}(a) \leq h$, then $\varpi(a) \leq h(q-1) = (q-1)m-\ell-1$. It then follows that $g_{(q,m,h)}(x)$ divides $g^R_{(q,m,\ell)}(x)$. Consequently, $\mathtt{PGRM}(q,m,\ell)$ is a subcode of $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$. But by Theorem 1, the minimum distance of $\mathtt{PGRM}(q,m,\ell)$ is equal to

$$(q-\ell_0)q^{m-\ell_1-1} - 1 = 2q^h - 1.$$

The desired upper bound on d then follows. ■

When $q=2$, the code $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$ clearly becomes the classical punctured binary Reed-Muller code. Hence, $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$ is indeed a generalisation of the original punctured binary Reed-Muller code. In addition, when $q=2$, the lower bound and the upper bound in (7) become identical.

Open Problem 1. *Is it true that the minimum distance of the code $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$ is equal to $(q^{h+1}-1)/(q-1)$?*

Example 1. *The following is a list of examples of the code $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$.*

- *When $(q,m,h) = (3,3,1)$, $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$ has parameters $[26,20,4]$.*
- *When $(q,m,h) = (3,4,1)$, $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$ has parameters $[80,72,4]$.*
- *When $(q,m,h) = (3,4,2)$, $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$ has parameters $[80,48,13]$.*
- *When $(q,m,h) = (3,4,3)$, $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$ has parameters $[80,16,40]$.*
- *When $(q,m,h) = (4,3,1)$, $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$ has parameters $[63,54,5]$.*

B. The dual codes $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)^{\perp}$

When $q=2$, the parameters of the dual code $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)^{\perp}$ are given by Theorems 1 and 2. Therefore, we need to study the dual code $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)^{\perp}$ for the case $q>2$ only.

We will need the following theorem ([8], see also [12, p. 153]).

Theorem 4 (Hartmann-Tzeng Bound)**.** *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a cyclic code of length n over* GF(q) *with defining set T. Let A be a set of $\delta-1$ consecutive elements of T and $B=\{jb \bmod n : 0\le j\le s\}$, where* $\gcd(b,n)<\delta$. *If $A+B\subseteq T$, then the minimum distance d of $\mathcal{C}$ satisfies $d\ge\delta+s$.*

The following theorem gives information on the parameters of the dual code $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)^{\perp}$.

Theorem 5. *Let $m\ge 2$ and $1\le h\le m-1$. The dual code $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)^{\perp}$ has parameters $[q^m-1,k^{\perp},d^{\perp}]$, where*

$$k^{\perp}=\sum_{i=1}^{h}\binom{m}{i}(q-1)^i.$$

The minimum distance $d^{\perp}$ of $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)^{\perp}$ is lower bounded by

$$d^{\perp}\ge q^{m-h}+q-2.$$

Proof: The desired conclusion on the dimension of $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)^{\perp}$ follows from the dimension of $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$. What remains to be proved is the lower bound on the minimum distance $d^{\perp}$. Let $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)^{c}$ denote the complement of $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$, which is generated by the check polynomial of $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$. It is well known that $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)^{c}$ and $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)^{\perp}$ have the same length, dimension and minimum distance.

By definition, the defining set of $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)^{c}$ is

$$I(q,m,h)^{c}:=\{0\}\cup\{1\le b\le n-1 : \mathrm{wt}(b)\ge h+1\}.$$

Let $b=q^{m-h}+q^{m-h+1}+\cdots+q^{m-1}$. Define

$$A=\{a+b : 1\le a\le q^{m-h}-1\}$$

and

$$B=\{jb : 0\le j\le q-2\}.$$

It is straightforward to verify that $A+B\subset I(q,m,h)^{c}$. Note that $n\in A+B$. In this case, we identify n with 0.

Clearly, A is a set of $q^{m-h}-1$ consecutive elements in the defining set $I(q,m,h)^{c}$. Note that

$$\gcd(b,n)=\gcd\left(\frac{q^h-1}{q-1},q^m-1\right)\le\gcd(q^h-1,q^m-1)=q^{\gcd(h,m)}-1.$$

By assumption, $1\le h\le m-1$. We then have $\gcd(h,m)\le m-h$. Consequently,

$$\gcd(b,n)<q^{m-h}.$$

The desired conclusion on $d^{\perp}$ then follows from Theorem 4. ■

When $q=2$, the lower bound on the minimum distance $d^{\perp}$ of $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)^{\perp}$ given in Theorem 5 is achieved. It is open if this lower bound can be improved for $q>2$.

Open Problem 2. *Determine the minimum distance $d^{\perp}$ of the code $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)^{\perp}$.*

To further study the dual code $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)^{\perp}$, we need to establish relations between $\mathrm{wt}(a)$ and $\mathrm{wt}(n-a)$ for $a\in\mathcal{N}$. Let $a\in\mathcal{N}$ and let

$$a=\sum_{j=0}^{m-1}a_j q^j$$

be the q-adic expansion of a. We define

$$\gamma(a) = |\{0 \le j \le m-1 : 1 \le a_j < q-1\}| = \mathrm{wt}(a) - |\{0 \le j \le m-1 : a_j = q-1\}|.$$

Then we have the following lemma whose proof is straightforward and omitted.

Lemma 6. *For $a \in \mathcal{N}$, we have*

$$\mathrm{wt}(n-a) = m - \mathrm{wt}(a) + \gamma(a) = m - |\{0 \le j \le m-1 : a_j = q-1\}|.$$

For $0 \le i \le m$, define

$$N(i) = \{a \in \mathcal{N} : \mathrm{wt}(a) = i\}$$

and

$$-N(i) = \{n-a : a \in N(i)\}.$$

Clearly, $|N(i)| = \binom{m}{i}(q-1)^i$.

The following lemma will be useful later.

Lemma 7. *In the set $-N(i)$, there are exactly $\binom{m}{i}\binom{i}{j}(q-2)^j$ elements with Hamming weight $m-i+j$ for each j with $0 \le j \le i$.*

Proof: Let $a \in N(i)$. By definition, $\mathrm{wt}(a) = i$. It follows from Lemma 6 that

$$\mathrm{wt}(n-a) = m - i + \gamma(a).$$

It is easily seen that

$$|\{1 \le a \le n-1 : \mathrm{wt}(a) = i \text{ and } \gamma(a) = j\}| = \binom{m}{i}\binom{i}{j}(q-2)^j.$$

This completes the proof. ■

Theorem 8. *$\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)^\perp$ is a proper subcode of $\mathcal{U}(q,m,m-1-h)$. When $q=2$, $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)^\perp$ is the even-weight subcode of $\mathcal{U}(q,m,m-1-h)$.*

Proof: By definition, the defining set of $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)^\perp$ is $-I(q,m,h)^c$. We now prove that

$$I(q,m,m-1-h) \subset -I(q,m,h)^c.$$

This is equivalent to proving that for every $a \in I(q,m,m-1-h)$, $n-a \in I(q,m,h)^c$. This is clearly true by Lemma 6. Consequently, $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)^\perp$ is a proper subcode of $\mathcal{U}(q,m,m-1-h)$.

When $q=2$, we have always the equality that $\mathrm{wt}(a) = m - \mathrm{wt}(n-a)$ for all a. Hence, in this case, we have

$$\{0\} \cup I(q,m,m-1-h) = -I(q,m,h)^c.$$

As a result, $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)^\perp$ is the even-weight subcode of $\mathcal{U}(q,m,m-1-h)$ when $q=2$. ■

Experimental data shows that one of $I(q,m,m-h)$ and $-I(q,m,h)^c$ is not a subset of the other. Consequently, one of $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)^\perp$ and $\mathcal{U}(q,m,m-h)$ is not a subcode of the other.

Example 2. *The following is a list of examples of the code $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)^\perp$.*

- *When $(q,m,h) = (2,4,2)$, the code $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)^\perp$ has parameters $[15,10,4]$. In this case, the lower bound on the minimum distance is achieved.*
- *When $(q,m,h) = (3,3,1)$, the code $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)^\perp$ has parameters $[26,6,15]$. In this case, the lower bound on the minimum distance is 10.*
- *When $(q,m,h) = (3,3,2)$, the code $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)^\perp$ has parameters $[26,18,6]$. In this case, the lower bound on the minimum distance is 4.*

C. The BCH cover of the cyclic code $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$

Recall that $n = q^m - 1$. For any i with $0 \le i \le n-1$, let $\mathrm{m}_i(x)$ denote the minimal polynomial of α^i over $\mathrm{GF}(q)$. For any $2 \le \delta \le n$, define

$$\bar{g}_{(q,n,\delta,b)}(x) = \mathrm{lcm}(\mathrm{m}_b(x), \mathrm{m}_{b+1}(x), \cdots, \mathrm{m}_{b+\delta-2}(x)), \tag{8}$$

where b is an integer, lcm denotes the least common multiple of these minimal polynomials, and the addition in the subscript $b+i$ of $\mathrm{m}_{b+i}(x)$ always means the integer addition modulo n. Let $\mathtt{BCH}(q,n,\delta,b)$ denote the cyclic code of length n with generator polynomial $\bar{g}_{(q,n,\delta,b)}(x)$.

When $b = 1$, the set $\mathtt{BCH}(q,n,\delta,b)$ is called a *narrow-sense primitive BCH code* with *designed distance* δ.

The BCH cover of a cyclic code is the BCH code with the smallest dimension containing the cyclic code as a subcode.

Theorem 9. *$\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$ is a subcode of $\mathtt{BCH}(q,n,(q^{h+1}-1)/(q-1),1)$.*

Proof: In the proof of Theorem 3, we have shown that

$$\{1,2,3,\cdots,(q^{h+1}-1)/(q-1)-1\} \subset I(q,m,h).$$

Hence, the generator polynomial of $\mathtt{BCH}(q,n,(q^{h+1}-1)/(q-1),1)$ is a divisor of that of $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$. Hence, $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$ is a subcode of $\mathtt{BCH}(q,n,(q^{h+1}-1)/(q-1),1)$. ■

When $h = 1$ or $h = m-1$, the two codes are identical. In other cases, the dimension of the code $\mathtt{BCH}(q,n,(q^{h+1}-1)/(q-1),1)$ is larger than that of $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$.

The BCH cover of $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$ is $\mathtt{BCH}(q,n,(q^{h+1}-1)/(q-1),1)$ if the minimum distance of $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$ is indeed equal to $(q^{h+1}-1)/(q-1)$.

D. Comparisons of the two codes $\mathtt{PGRM}_q(\ell,m)$ and $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$

In this subsection, we compare the two codes $\mathtt{PGRM}_q(\ell,m)$ and $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$ and make some comments.

First of all, the two codes $\mathtt{PGRM}_q(\ell,m)$ and $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$ are clearly different, as their dimensions and minimum distances are different. Secondly, Theorem 8 tells us that $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)^{\perp}$ is indeed a subcode of $\mathcal{U}(q,m,m-1-h)$. But the code $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$ does not have the property of Theorem 2.

V. The extended codes $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,h)$ and their applications in combinatorics

Let $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,h)$ denote the extended code of $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$ defined in Section IV. The following theorem follows directly from Theorem 3.

Theorem 10. *Let $m \ge 2$ and $1 \le h \le m-1$. Then $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,h)$ has parameters $[q^m,k,d]$, where*

$$k = q^m - \sum_{i=0}^{h} \binom{m}{i} (q-1)^i.$$

and

$$\frac{q^{h+1}-1}{q-1} \le d \le 2q^h. \tag{9}$$

The code $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,h)$ is the newly generalised Reed-Muller code. Our objective in this section is to prove that $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,h)$ is affine-invariant and demonstrates its application in combinatorics.

A. The code $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,h)$ is affine-invariant

1) Automorphism groups of linear codes: The set of coordinate permutations that map a code $\mathcal{C}$ to itself forms a group, which is referred to as the *permutation automorphism group* of $\mathcal{C}$ and denoted by $\mathrm{PAut}(\mathcal{C})$. If $\mathcal{C}$ is a code of length n, then $\mathrm{PAut}(\mathcal{C})$ is a subgroup of the *symmetric group* Sym_n.

A *monomial matrix* over $\mathrm{GF}(q)$ is a square matrix having exactly one nonzero element of $\mathrm{GF}(q)$ in each row and column. A monomial matrix M can be written either in the form DP or the form PD_1, where D and D_1 are diagonal matrices and P is a permutation matrix.

The set of monomial matrices that map $\mathcal{C}$ to itself forms the group $\mathrm{MAut}(\mathcal{C})$, which is called the *monomial automorphism group* of $\mathcal{C}$. Clearly, we have

$$\mathrm{PAut}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \mathrm{MAut}(\mathcal{C}).$$

The *automorphism group* of $\mathcal{C}$, denoted by $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$, is the set of maps of the form $M\gamma$, where M is a monomial matrix and γ is a field automorphism, that map $\mathcal{C}$ to itself. In the binary case, $\mathrm{PAut}(\mathcal{C})$, $\mathrm{MAut}(\mathcal{C})$ and $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$ are the same. If q is a prime, $\mathrm{MAut}(\mathcal{C})$ and $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$ are identical. In general, we have

$$\mathrm{PAut}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \mathrm{MAut}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C}).$$

By definition, every element in $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$ is of the form $DP\gamma$, where D is a diagonal matrix, P is a permutation matrix, and γ is an automorphism of $\mathrm{GF}(q)$. The automorphism group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$ is said to be t-transitive if for every pair of t-element ordered sets of coordinates, there is an element $DP\gamma$ of the automorphism group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$ such that its permutation part P sends the first set to the second set.

It is in general very difficult to determine the full automorphism group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$ of a linear code $\mathcal{C}$. However, for many applications it is sufficient to find a proper subgroup of the $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$. We will do this for the code $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,h)$ subsequently.

2) Affine-invariant linear codes: In this section, we first give a special representation of primitive cyclic codes and their extended codes, and then define and characterise affine-invariant codes. We will skip proof details, but refer the reader to [12, Section 4.7] for a detailed proof of the major results presented in this section.

A cyclic code of length $n = q^m - 1$ over $\mathrm{GF}(q)$ for some positive integer m is called a *primitive cyclic code*. Let $\mathcal{R}_n$ denote the quotient ring $\mathrm{GF}(q)[x]/(x^n - 1)$. Any cyclic code $\mathcal{C}$ of length $n = q^m - 1$ over $\mathrm{GF}(q)$ is an ideal of $\mathcal{R}_n$, and is generated by a monic polynomial $g(x)$ of the least degree over $\mathrm{GF}(q)$. This polynomial is called the generator polynomial of the cyclic code $\mathcal{C}$, and can be expressed as

$$g(x) = \prod_{t \in T} (x - \alpha^t),$$

where α is a generator of $\mathrm{GF}(q^m)^*$, T is a subset of $\mathcal{N} = \{0, 1, \cdots, n-1\}$ and a union of some q-cyclotomic cosets modulo n. The set T is called a *defining set* of $\mathcal{C}$ with respect to α. When $\mathcal{C}$ is viewed as a subset of $\mathcal{R}_n$, every codeword of $\mathcal{C}$ is a polynomial $c(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} c_i x^i$, where all $c_i \in \mathrm{GF}(q)$. A primitive cyclic code $\mathcal{C}$ is called *even-like* if 1 is a zero of its generator polynomial, and *odd-like* otherwise.

Let $\mathtt{J}$ and $\mathtt{J}^*$ denote $\mathrm{GF}(q^m)$ and $\mathrm{GF}(q^m)^*$, respectively. Let α be a primitive element of $\mathrm{GF}(q^m)$. The set $\mathtt{J}$ will be the index set of the extended cyclic codes of length q^m, and the set $\mathtt{J}^*$ will be the index set of the cyclic codes of length n. Let X be an indeterminate. Define

$$\mathrm{GF}(q)[\mathtt{J}] = \left\{ a = \sum_{g \in \mathtt{J}} a_g X^g : a_g \in \mathrm{GF}(q) \text{ for all } g \in \mathtt{J} \right\}. \tag{10}$$

The set $\mathrm{GF}(q)[\mathtt{J}]$ is an algebra under the following operations

$$u \sum_{g \in \mathtt{J}} a_g X^g + v \sum_{g \in \mathtt{J}} b_g X^g = \sum_{g \in \mathtt{J}} (u a_g + v b_g) X^g$$

for all $u, v \in \mathrm{GF}(q)$, and

$$\left(\sum_{g\in \mathtt{J}} a_g X^g\right)\left(\sum_{g\in \mathtt{J}} b_g X^g\right) = \sum_{g\in \mathtt{J}}\left(\sum_{h\in \mathtt{J}} a_h b_{g-h}\right) X^g. \tag{11}$$

The zero and unit of $\mathrm{GF}(q)[\mathtt{J}]$ are $\sum_{g\in \mathtt{J}} 0X^g$ and X^0, respectively.

Similarly, let

$$\mathrm{GF}(q)[\mathtt{J}^*] = \left\{ a = \sum_{g\in \mathtt{J}^*} a_g X^g : a_g \in \mathrm{GF}(q) \text{ for all } g \in \mathtt{J}^* \right\}. \tag{12}$$

The set $\mathrm{GF}(q)[\mathtt{J}^*]$ is not a subalgebra, but a subspace of $\mathrm{GF}(q)[\mathtt{J}]$. Obviously, the elements of $\mathrm{GF}(q)[\mathtt{J}^*]$ are of the form

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_{\alpha^i} X^{\alpha^i},$$

and those of $\mathrm{GF}(q)[\mathtt{J}]$ are of the form

$$a_0 X^0 + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_{\alpha^i} X^{\alpha^i}.$$

Subsets of the subspace $\mathrm{GF}(q)[\mathtt{J}^*]$ will be used to characterise primitive cyclic codes over $\mathrm{GF}(q)$ and those of the algebra $\mathrm{GF}(q)[\mathtt{J}]$ will be employed to characterise extended primitive cyclic codes over $\mathrm{GF}(q)$.

We define a one-to-one correspondence between $\mathcal{R}_n$ and $\mathrm{GF}(q)[\mathtt{J}^*]$ by

$$\Upsilon : c(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} c_i x^i \rightarrow C(X) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} C_{\alpha^i} X^{\alpha^i}, \tag{13}$$

where $C_{\alpha^i} = c_i$ for all i.

The following theorem is obviously true.

Theorem 11. *$\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{R}_n$ has the circulant cyclic shift property if and only if $\Upsilon(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \mathrm{GF}(q)[\mathtt{J}^*]$ has the property that*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} C_{\alpha^i} X^{\alpha^i} = \sum_{g\in \mathtt{J}^*} C_g X^g \in \Upsilon(\mathcal{C})$$

if and only if

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} C_{\alpha^i} X^{\alpha\alpha^i} = \sum_{g\in \mathtt{J}^*} C_g X^{\alpha g} \in \Upsilon(\mathcal{C})$$

With Theorem 11, every primitive cyclic code over $\mathrm{GF}(q)$ can be viewed as a special subset of $\mathrm{GF}(q)[\mathtt{J}^*]$ having the property documented in this theorem. This special representation of primitive cyclic codes over $\mathrm{GF}(q)$ will be very useful for determining a subgroup of the automorphism group of certain primitive cyclic codes.

It is now time to extend primitive cyclic codes, which are subsets of $\mathrm{GF}(q)[\mathtt{J}^*]$. We use the element $0 \in \mathtt{J}$ to index the extended coordinate. The extended codeword $\overline{C}(X)$ of a codeword $C(X) = \sum_{g\in \mathtt{J}^*} C_g X^g$ in $\mathrm{GF}(q)[\mathtt{J}^*]$ is defined by

$$\overline{C}(X) = \sum_{g\in \mathtt{J}} C_g X^g \tag{14}$$

with $\sum_{g\in \mathtt{J}} C_g = 0$.

Notice that $X^{\alpha 0} = X^0 = 1$. The following then follows from Theorem 11.

Theorem 12. *The extended code $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$ of a cyclic code $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathrm{GF}(q)[\mathtt{J}^*]$ is a subspace of $\mathrm{GF}(q)[\mathtt{J}]$ such that*

$$\overline{C}(X) = \sum_{g\in \mathtt{J}} C_g X^g \in \overline{\mathcal{C}} \text{ if and only if } \sum_{g\in \mathtt{J}} C_g X^{\alpha g} \in \overline{\mathcal{C}} \text{ and } \sum_{g\in \mathtt{J}} C_g = 0.$$

If a cyclic code $\mathcal{C}$ is viewed as an ideal of $\mathcal{R}_n = \mathrm{GF}(q)[x]/(x^n-1)$, it can be defined by its set of zeros or its defining set. When $\mathcal{C}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$ are put in the settings $\mathrm{GF}(q)[\mathtt{J}^*]$ and $\mathrm{GF}(q)[\mathtt{J}]$, respectively, they can be defined with some counterpart of the defining set. This can be done with the assistance of the following function ϕ_s from $\mathrm{GF}(q)[\mathtt{J}]$ to $\mathtt{J}$:

$$\phi_s\left(\sum_{g\in \mathtt{J}} C_g X^g\right) = \sum_{g\in \mathtt{J}} C_g g^s, \tag{15}$$

where $s \in \overline{\mathcal{N}} := \{i : 0 \le i \le n\}$ and by convention $0^0 = 1$ in $\mathtt{J}$.

The following follows from Theorem 12 and the definition of ϕ_s directly.

Lemma 13. *$\overline{C}(X)$ is the extended codeword of $C(X) \in \mathrm{GF}(q)[\mathtt{J}^*]$ if and only if $\phi_0(\overline{C}(X)) = 0$. In particular, if $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$ is the extended code of a primitive cyclic code $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathrm{GF}(q)[\mathtt{J}^*]$, then $\phi_0(\overline{C}(X)) = 0$ for all $\overline{C}(X) \in \overline{\mathcal{C}}$.*

Lemma 14. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a primitive cyclic code of length n over $\mathrm{GF}(q)$. Let T be the defining set of $\mathcal{C}$ with respect to α, when it is viewed as an ideal of $\mathcal{R}_n$. Let $s \in T$ and $1 \le s \le n-1$. We have then $\phi_s(\overline{C}(X)) = 0$ for all $\overline{C}(X) \in \overline{\mathcal{C}}$.*

Lemma 15. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a primitive cyclic code of length n over $\mathrm{GF}(q)$. Let T be the defining set of $\mathcal{C}$ with respect to α, when it is viewed as an ideal of $\mathcal{R}_n$. Then $0 \in T$ if and only if $\phi_n(\overline{C}(X)) = 0$ for all $\overline{C}(X) \in \overline{\mathcal{C}}$.*

Combining Lemmas 13, 14, 15 and the discussions above, we can define an extended cyclic code in terms of a defining set as follows.

A code $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$ of length q^m is an *extended primitive cyclic code* with definition set $\overline{T}$ provided $\overline{T} \setminus \{n\} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{N}}$ is a union of q-cyclotomic cosets modulo $n = q^m - 1$ with $0 \in \overline{T}$ and

$$\overline{\mathcal{C}} = \left\{\overline{C}(X) \in \mathrm{GF}(q)[\mathtt{J}] : \phi_s(\overline{C}(X)) = 0 \text{ for all } s \in \overline{T}\right\}. \tag{16}$$

The following remarks are helpful for fully understanding the characterisation of extended primitive cyclic codes:

- The condition that $\overline{T} \setminus \{n\} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{N}}$ is a union of q-cyclotomic cosets modulo $n = q^m - 1$ is to ensure that the code $\mathcal{C}$ obtained by puncturing the first coordinate of $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$ and ordering the elements of $\mathtt{J}$ with $(0, \alpha^n, \alpha^1, \cdots, \alpha^{n-1})$ is a primitive cyclic code.
- The additional requirement $0 \in \overline{T}$ and (16) are to make sure that $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$ is the extended code of $\mathcal{C}$.
- If $n \in \overline{T}$, then $\mathcal{C}$ is an even-like code. In this case, the extension is trivial, i.e., the extended coordinate in every codeword of $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$ is always equal to 0. If $n \notin \overline{T}$, then $0 \notin T$. Thus, the extension is nontrivial.
- If $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$ is the extended code of a primitive cyclic code $\mathcal{C}$, then

$$\overline{T} = \begin{cases} \{0\} \cup T & \text{if } 0 \notin T, \\ \{0, n\} \cup T & \text{if } 0 \in T. \end{cases}$$

  where T and $\overline{T}$ are the defining sets of $\mathcal{C}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$, respectively.
- The following diagram illustrates the relations among the two codes and their definition sets:

$$\begin{array}{l} \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{R}_n \\ T \subseteq \mathcal{N} \end{array} \iff \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathrm{GF}(q)[\mathtt{J}^*] \Longrightarrow \begin{array}{r} \mathrm{GF}(q)[\mathtt{J}] \supseteq \overline{\mathcal{C}} \\ \overline{T} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{N}} \end{array}$$

Let σ be a permutation on $\mathtt{J}$. This permutation acts on a code $\overline{\mathcal{C}} \subseteq \mathrm{GF}(q)[\mathtt{J}]$ as follows:

$$\sigma\left(\sum_{g\in \mathtt{J}} C_g X^g\right) = \sum_{g\in \mathtt{J}} C_g X^{\sigma(g)}. \tag{17}$$

The *affine permutation group*, denoted by $\mathrm{AGL}(1,q^m)$, is defined by

$$\mathrm{AGL}(1,q^m) = \{\sigma_{(a,b)}(y) = ay+b : a \in \mathtt{J}^*, b \in \mathtt{J}\}. \tag{18}$$

We have the following conclusions about $\mathrm{AGL}(1,q^m)$ whose proofs are straightforward:

- $\mathrm{AGL}(1,q^m)$ is a permutation group on $\mathtt{J}$ under the function composition.
- The group action of $\mathrm{AGL}(1,q^m)$ on $\mathrm{GF}(q^m)$ is doubly transitive, i.e., 2-transitive.
- $\mathrm{AGL}(1,q^m)$ has order $(n+1)n = q^m(q^m-1)$.
- Obviously, the maps $\sigma_{(a,0)}$ are merely the cyclic shifts on the coordinates $(\alpha^n, \alpha^1, \cdots, \alpha^{n-1})$ each fixing the coordinate 0.

An *affine-invariant code* is an extended primitive cyclic code $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$ such that $\mathrm{AGL}(1,q^m) \subseteq \mathrm{PAut}(\overline{\mathcal{C}})$. For certain applications, it is important to know if a given extended primitive cyclic code $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$ is affine-invariant or not. This question can be answered by examining the defining set of the code. In order to do this, we introduce a partial ordering $\preceq$ on $\overline{\mathcal{N}}$. Suppose that $q = p^t$ for some positive integer t. Then by definition $\overline{\mathcal{N}} = \{0,1,2,\cdots,n\}$, where $n = q^m - 1 = p^{mt} - 1$. The p-adic expansion of each $s \in \overline{\mathcal{N}}$ is given by

$$s = \sum_{i=0}^{mt-1} s_i p^i, \text{ where } 0 \le s_i < p \text{ for all } 0 \le i \le mt-1.$$

Let the p-adic expansion of $r \in \overline{\mathcal{N}}$ be

$$r = \sum_{i=0}^{mt-1} r_i p^i.$$

We say that $r \preceq s$ if $r_i \le s_i$ for all $0 \le i \le mt-1$. By definition, we have $r \le s$ if $r \preceq s$.

The following is a characterisation of affine-invariant codes due to Kasami, Lin and Peterson [9].

Theorem 16 (Kasami-Lin-Peterson)**.** *Let $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$ be an extended cyclic code of length q^m over $\mathrm{GF}(q)$ with defining set $\overline{T}$. The code $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$ is affine-invariant if and only if whenever $s \in \overline{T}$ then $r \in \overline{T}$ for all $r \in \overline{\mathcal{N}}$ with $r \preceq s$.*

Theorem 16 will be employed in the next section. It is a very useful tool to prove that an extended primitive cyclic code is affine-invariant.

3) $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,h)$ is affine-invariant:

Theorem 17. *Let q be a prime and $1 \le h \le m-1$. Then $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,h)$ is affine-invariant.*

Proof: By (5), the defining set $\overline{T}$ of $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,h)$ is given by

$$\overline{T} = \{0\} \cup \{1 \le a \le n-1 : 1 \le \mathrm{wt}(a) \le h\}.$$

Recall that $\overline{\mathcal{N}} = \{0,1,\cdots,n\}$. Let $s \in \overline{T}$ and $r \in \overline{\mathcal{N}}$. Assume that $r \preceq s$. We need prove that $r \in \overline{T}$ by Theorem 16.

If $s = 0$, then $r = 0$. In this case, we have indeed $r \in \overline{T}$. We now assume that $s > 0$ and $r > 0$. Since $r \preceq s$, we have

$$1 \le \mathrm{wt}(r) \le \mathrm{wt}(s) < h.$$

This means that $r \in \overline{T}$. The desired conclusion then follows. ■

Corollary 18. *The automorphism group $\mathrm{Aut}(\widehat{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,h))$ is doubly transitive.*

Proof: Recall that the group action of $\mathrm{AGL}(1,q^m)$ on $\mathrm{GF}(q^m)$ is doubly transitive. By Theorem 17, $\mathrm{AGL}(1,q^m) \subseteq \mathrm{Aut}(\widehat{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,h))$. Recall that the coordinates of $\mathrm{Aut}(\widehat{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,h))$ are indexed by the elements in $\mathrm{GF}(q^m)$. The desired conclusion then follows. ■

B. $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,h)$ holds 2-designs

Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a set of $v \geq 1$ elements, and let $\mathcal{B}$ be a set of k-subsets of $\mathcal{P}$, where k is a positive integer with $1 \leq k \leq v$. Let t be a positive integer with $t \leq k$. The pair $\mathcal{D} = (\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{B})$ is called a t-(v,k,λ) *design*, or simply *t-design*, if every t-subset of $\mathcal{P}$ is contained in exactly λ elements of $\mathcal{B}$. The elements of $\mathcal{P}$ are called points, and those of $\mathcal{B}$ are referred to as blocks. We usually use b to denote the number of blocks in $\mathcal{B}$. A t-design is called *simple* if $\mathcal{B}$ does not contain repeated blocks. In this paper, we consider only simple t-designs. A t-design is called *symmetric* if $v = b$. It is clear that t-designs with $k = t$ or $k = v$ always exist. Such t-designs are *trivial*. In this paper, we consider only t-designs with $v > k > t$. A t-(v,k,λ) design is referred to as a *Steiner system* if $t \geq 2$ and $\lambda = 1$, and is denoted by $S(t,k,v)$.

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a $[v,\kappa,d]$ linear code over $\mathrm{GF}(q)$. Let $A_i := A_i(\mathcal{C})$, which denotes the number of codewords with Hamming weight i in $\mathcal{C}$, where $0 \leq i \leq v$. The sequence $(A_0, A_1, \cdots, A_v)$ is called the *weight distribution* of $\mathcal{C}$, and $\sum_{i=0}^{v} A_i z^i$ is referred to as the *weight enumerator* of $\mathcal{C}$. For each k with $A_k \neq 0$, let $\mathcal{B}_k$ denote the set of the supports of all codewords with Hamming weight k in $\mathcal{C}$, where the coordinates of a codeword are indexed by $(0,1,2,\cdots,v-1)$. Let $\mathcal{P} = \{0,1,2,\cdots,v-1\}$. The pair $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{B}_k)$ may be a t-(v,k,λ) design for some positive integer λ, which is called a *support design* of the code. In such a case, we say that the code $\mathcal{C}$ holds a t-(v,k,λ) design.

A proof of the following theorem can be found in [12, p. 308].

Theorem 19. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a linear code of length n over $\mathrm{GF}(q)$ where $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$ is t-transitive. Then the codewords of any weight $i \geq t$ of $\mathcal{C}$ hold a t-design.*

The task of this section is to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 20. *Let $m \geq 2$ and $1 \leq h \leq m-1$. Let $\hat{A}_i$ denote the number of codewords of weight i in $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,h)$. Then for each i with $\hat{A}_i \neq 0$, the supports of the codewords of weight i form a 2-design.*

Proof: The desired conclusion follows from Theorem 19 and Corollary 18. ■

Example 3. *Let $(q,m,h) = (3,3,2)$. Then $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,h)$ has parameters $[27,8,14]$ and weight enumerator*

$$1 + 810z^{14} + 702z^{15} + 1404z^{17} + 780z^{18} + 2106z^{20} + 702z^{21} + 54z^{26} + 2z^{27}.$$

It holds 2-$(27,k,\lambda)$ designs for the following pairs (k,λ):

$$(14,105),\ (15,105),\ (17,272),\ (18,170),\ (20,570),\ (21,210).$$

We remark that $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,h)$ does not hold 3-designs in general. Of course, it holds 3-designs when $q = 2$, as $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,h)$ is identical with the classical binary Reed-Muller code when $q = 2$. Though $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,h)$ holds many 2-(q^m,k,λ) designs, determining the parameters k and λ may be hard. The reader is cordially invited to attack this problem.

VI. A family of reversible cyclic codes from the codes $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$

A code $\mathcal{C}$ is called *reversible* if $(c_0,c_1,\ldots,c_{n-1}) \in \mathcal{C}$ implies that $(c_{n-1},c_{n-2},\ldots,c_0) \in \mathcal{C}$.

Let $f(x) = f_j x^j + f_{j-1}x^{j-1} + \cdots + f_1 x + f_0$ be a polynomial over $\mathrm{GF}(q)$ with $f_j \neq 0$ and $f_0 \neq 0$. The reciprocal $f^*(x)$ of $f(x)$ is defined by

$$f^*(x) = f_0^{-1} x^j f(x^{-1}).$$

A polynomial $f(x)$ is called *self-reciprocal* if f and its reciprocal are identical.

The conclusions of the following theorem are known in the literature, and are easy to prove. We will employ some of them later.

Theorem 21. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a cyclic code over $\mathrm{GF}(q)$ with generator polynomial $g(x)$. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- $\mathcal{C}$ *is reversible.*
- g *is self-reciprocal.*
- β^{-1} *is a root of* g *for every root* β *of* $g(x)$ *over the splitting field of* $g(x)$.

If $\mathcal{C}$ is a reversible cyclic code of length n over GF(q), then $\mathcal{C} \oplus \mathcal{C}^{\perp} = \mathrm{GF}(q)^n$. Such a linear code is called a *linear code with complement dual (LCD)*, as its dual code is equal to its complement.

LCD cyclic codes over finite fields are interesting in both theory and applications [10], [11], [15]. An important application of LCD codes in cryptography was recently documented in [4]. This is our major motivation of constructing LCD codes.

We now employ the codes $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$ to construct reversible cyclic codes. To this end, we need to make some preparations.

Recall that

$$I(q,m,t) = \{1 \le i \le n-1 : 1 \le \mathrm{wt}(i) \le t\} \tag{19}$$

and

$$-I(q,m,t) = \{n-a : a \in I_{(q,m,t)}\},$$

where $1 \le t \le m$.

Lemma 22. *If* $1 \le t \le \lceil m/2 \rceil - 1$, *then* $I(q,n,t) \cap (-I(q,n,t)) = \emptyset$.

Proof: Note that

$$n = q^m - 1 = (q-1)q^{m-1} + (q-1)q^{m-2} + \cdots + (q-1)q + (q-1)q^0.$$

By Lemma 6, $\mathrm{wt}(n-i) \ge m - \mathrm{wt}(i)$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$.

If $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and $\mathrm{wt}(i) \le \lceil m/2 \rceil - 1$, then $\mathrm{wt}(n-i) \ge m - \mathrm{wt}(i) > \lceil m/2 \rceil - 1$. The desired conclusion then follows. ∎

Let $g_{(q,m,h)}(x)$ be the polynomial of (5), which is the generator polynomial of the cyclic code $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$. Let $g^*_{(q,m,h)}(x)$ denote the reciprocal of $g_{(q,m,h)}(x)$. Set

$$g(x) = (x-1)\mathrm{lcm}\left(g_{(q,m,h)}(x), g^*_{(q,m,h)}(x)\right).$$

Let $\overline{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,h)$ denote the cyclic code of length n over GF(q) with generator polynomial $g(x)$. It follows from Theorem 21 that $\overline{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,h)$ is reversible.

Information on the parameters of the reversible cyclic code $\overline{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,h)$ is given in the theorem below.

Theorem 23. *If* $1 \le h \le \lceil m/2 \rceil - 1$, *then the reversible cyclic code* $\overline{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,h)$ *has minimum distance*

$$d \ge 2\frac{q^{h+1}-1}{q-1}$$

and dimension

$$q^m - 2\sum_{i=0}^{h} \binom{m}{i} (q-1)^i. \tag{20}$$

Proof: When $1 \le h \le \lceil m/2 \rceil - 1$, it follows from Lemma 22 that $g_{(q,m,h)}(x)$ and $g^*_{(q,m,h)}(x)$ are relatively prime. Consequently, $g(x) = (x-1)g_{(q,m,h)}(x)g^*_{(q,m,h)}(x)$. Therefore,

$$\deg(g(x)) = 2\deg(g_{(q,m,h)}(x)) + 1.$$

By Theorem 3,

$$\deg(g_{(q,m,h)}(x)) = \sum_{i=1}^{h} \binom{m}{i} (q-1)^i.$$

The desired conclusion on the dimension then follows.

In this case, it follows from the proof of Theorem 3 that $g(x)$ has the roots α^i for all i in the set

$$\left\{n-\left(\frac{q^{h+1}-1}{q-1}-1\right),\cdots,n-2,n-1,0,1,2,\cdots,\frac{q^{h+1}-1}{q-1}-1\right\}.$$

The desired conclusion on the minimum distance then follows from the BCH bound. ■

Example 4. *The following is a list of examples of the reversible cyclic code* $\overline{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,h)$.

- *When* $(q,m,h)=(2,4,1)$*, the code* $\overline{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,h)$ *has parameters* $[15,6,6]$.
- *When* $(q,m,h)=(2,6,2)$*, the code* $\overline{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,h)$ *has parameters* $[63,20,14]$.
- *When* $(q,m,h)=(3,4,1)$*, the code* $\overline{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,h)$ *has parameters* $[80,63,8]$.

Open Problem 3. *Determine the minimum distance of the code* $\overline{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,h)$ *of Theorem 23.*

Theorem 24. *Let* $m\geq 2$ *be even. Then the reversible cyclic code* $\overline{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,m/2)$ *has minimum distance*

$$d\geq 2\frac{q^{(m+2)/2}-1}{q-1}$$

and dimension

$$q^m-2\sum_{i=0}^{m/2}\binom{m}{i}(q-1)^i+\binom{m}{\frac{m}{2}}. \tag{21}$$

Proof: The conclusion on the minimum distance comes from the BCH bound. We now prove the conclusion on the dimension of the code. It follows from Lemmas 22, 6 and 7 that $a\in I(q,m,m/2)\cap(-I(q,m,m/2))$ if and only if $\mathrm{wt}(a)=m/2$ and the q-adic expression of a is of the form

$$(q-1)(q^{i_1}+q^{i_2}+\cdots+q^{i_{m/2}}),$$

where $0\leq i_1<i_2<\cdots<i_{m/2}\leq m-1$. Consequently,

$$|I(q,m,m/2)\cap(-I(q,m,m/2))|=\binom{m}{\frac{m}{2}}.$$

As before, let $g_{(q,m,m/2)}(x)$ be the generator polynomial of the code $\mathcal{U}(q,m,m/2)$. Then the generator polynomial of $\overline{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,m/2)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} g(x) &= (x-1)\mathrm{lcm}\left(g_{(q,m,m/2)}(x),g^*_{(q,m,m/2)}(x)\right)\\ &= \frac{(x-1)g_{(q,m,m/2)}(x)g^*_{(q,m,m/2)}(x)}{\gcd\left(g_{(q,m,m/2)}(x),g^*_{(q,m,m/2)}(x)\right)}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \deg(g(x)) &= 2\deg(g_{(q,m,m/2)}(x))+1-\deg(\gcd(g_{(q,m,m/2)}(x),g^*_{(q,m,m/2)}(x))\\ &= 2\deg(g_{(q,m,m/2)}(x))+1-|I(q,m,m/2)\cap(-I(q,m,m/2))|\\ &= 1+2\sum_{i=1}^{m/2}\binom{m}{i}(q-1)^i-\binom{m}{\frac{m}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

The desired conclusion on the dimension then follows. ■

We point out that the dimension of the code $\overline{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,m/2)$ is equal to zero when $q=2$. Hence, the code is nontrivial only when $q>2$.

Example 5. *When* $(q,m)=(5,2)$*, the code* $\overline{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,m/2)$ *has parameters* $[24,9,12]$.

Open Problem 4. *Determine the minimum distance of the code $\overline{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,m/2)$ of Theorem 24.*

Theorem 25. *Let $m \geq 3$ be odd. Then the reversible cyclic code $\overline{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,(m+1)/2)$ has minimum distance*

$$d \geq 2\frac{q^{(m+3)/2}-1}{q-1}$$

and dimension

$$q^m - 2\sum_{i=0}^{(m+1)/2}\binom{m}{i}(q-1)^i + \frac{4+(q-2)(m+1)}{2}\binom{m}{\frac{m-1}{2}}. \tag{22}$$

Proof: The conclusion on the minimum distance comes from the BCH bound. We now prove the desired conclusion on the dimension of the code. It follows from Lemmas 22, 6 and 7 that $a \in I(q,m,(m+1)/2) \cap (-I(q,m,(m+1)/2))$ if and only if one of the following three cases happens:

C1: $\mathrm{wt}(a) = \frac{m-1}{2}$, $\mathrm{wt}(n-a) = \frac{m+1}{2}$, and the q-adic expression of a is of the form

$$(q-1)(q^{i_1}+q^{i_2}+\cdots+q^{i_{(m-1)/2}}),$$

where $0 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_{(m-1)/2} \leq m-1$. The total number of such a's is equal to $\binom{m}{(m-1)/2}$.

C2: $\mathrm{wt}(a) = \frac{m+1}{2}$, $\mathrm{wt}(n-a) = \frac{m-1}{2}$, and the q-adic expression of a is of the form

$$(q-1)(q^{i_1}+q^{i_2}+\cdots+q^{i_{(m+1)/2}}),$$

where $0 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_{(m+1)/2} \leq m-1$. The total number of such a's is equal to $\binom{m}{(m+1)/2}$.

C3: $\mathrm{wt}(a) = \frac{m+1}{2}$, $\mathrm{wt}(n-a) = \frac{m+1}{2}$, and the q-adic expression of a is of the form

$$a_{i_1}q^{i_1}+a_{i_2}q^{i_2}+\cdots+a_{i_{(m+1)/2}}q^{i_{(m+1)/2}},$$

where $0 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_{(m+1)/2} \leq m-1$, $1 \leq a_{i_j} \leq q-1$, and all the entries of the vector $(a_{i_1}, a_{i_2}, \cdots, a_{i_{(m+1)/2}})$ are $q-1$ except one that could be any element in $\{1,2,\cdots,q-2\}$. The total number of such a's is equal to

$$\frac{(m+1)(q-2)}{2}\binom{m}{\frac{m+1}{2}}.$$

Summarizing the conclusions in the three cases above, we obtain that

$$|I(q,m,(m+1)/2) \cap (-I(q,m,(m+1)/2))| = \frac{4+(q-2)(m+1)}{2}\binom{m}{\frac{m-1}{2}}.$$

As before, let $g_{(q,m,(m+1)/2)}(x)$ be the polynomial of the code $\mathcal{U}(q,m,(m+1)/2)$. Then the generator polynomial of $\overline{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,(m+1)/2)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} g(x) &= (x-1)\mathrm{lcm}\left(g_{(q,m,(m+1)/2)}(x), g^*_{(q,m,(m+1)/2)}(x)\right) \\ &= \frac{(x-1)g_{(q,m,(m+1)/2)}(x)g^*_{(q,m,(m+1)/2)}(x)}{\gcd\left(g_{(q,m,(m+1)/2)}(x), g^*_{(q,m,(m+1)/2)}(x)\right)}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \deg(g(x)) &= 2\deg(g_{(q,m,(m+1)/2)}(x)) + 1 - \deg(\gcd(g_{(q,m,(m+1)/2)}(x), g^*_{(q,m,(m+1)/2)}(x)) \\ &= 2\deg(g_{(q,m,(m+1)/2)}(x)) + 1 - |I(q,m,(m+1)/2) \cap (-I(q,m,(m+1)/2))| \\ &= 1 + 2\sum_{i=1}^{(m+1)/2}\binom{m}{i}(q-1)^i - \frac{4+(q-2)(m+1)}{2}\binom{m}{\frac{m-1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

The desired conclusion on the dimension then follows. ■

We point out that the dimension of $\overline{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,(m+1)/2)$ is equal to zero when $q=2$. Hence, the code is nontrivial only when $q>2$.

Example 6. *When* $(q,m)=(4,3)$, $\overline{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,(m+1)/2)$ *has parameters* $[63,8,42]$.

Open Problem 5. *Determine the minimum distance of the code* $\overline{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,(m+1)/2)$ *of Theorem 25.*

VII. Summary and concluding remarks

The first contribution of this paper is the new generalisation of the classical punctured binary Reed-Muller codes. The newly generalised codes $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$ are documented in Theorem 3. A lower bound and a upper bound on the minimum distance of $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$ were developed and given in Theorem 3. Experimental data indicates that this lower bound is indeed the minimum distance. However, we were not able to prove this conjecture. It would be nice if this open problem can be settled. The dual code $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)^{\perp}$ was also studied. But the minimum distance $d^{\perp}$ of $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)^{\perp}$ is also open, though a lower bound on $d^{\perp}$ was given in Theorem 5. The locality of both $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$ and $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)^{\perp}$ depends on $d^{\perp}$ and d respectively. Hence, it is also valuable to settle Open Problem 2.

The second contribution of this paper is to prove that the extended code $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,h)$ is affine-invariant and holds 2-designs.

The third contribution of this paper is the construction of the reversible cyclic codes $\overline{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,h)$, which are based on the cyclic codes $\mathcal{U}(q,m,h)$. The dimension of $\overline{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,h)$ was settled for all h with $1\leq h\leq \lceil m/2\rceil$. A lower bound on the minimum distance of the reversible cyclic code $\overline{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,h)$ was developed. But the minimum distance of $\overline{\mathcal{U}}(q,m,h)$ is unknown. It would be nice if Open Problems 3, 4 and 5 can be resolved.

References

[1] E. F. Assmus and J. D. Key, *Designs and Their Codes*, *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*, Vol. 103, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992.

[2] E. F. Assmus, Jr and J. D. Key, "Polynomial codes and finite geometries", In: V.S. Pless and W.C. Huffman (Eds.), *Handbook of Coding Theory*, Chapter 16, pp. 1269–1343, Elsevier, 1998.

[3] E. Betti and M. Sala, "A new bound for the minimum distance of a cyclic code from its defining set," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 52, no. 8, pp. 3700–3706, 2006.

[4] C. Carlet and S. Guilley, "Complementary dual codes for counter-measures to side-channel attacks," In: E. R. Pinto et al. (eds.), *Coding Theory and Applications*, CIM Series in Mathematical Sciences, vol. 3, pp. 97–105, Springer Verlag, 2014.

[5] P. Delsarte, J. M. Goethals, and F. J. MacWilliams, "On generalized Reed-Muller codes and their relatives, *Information and Control*, vol. 16, pp. 403–442, 1972.

[6] P. Ding and J. D. Key, "Minimum-weight codewords as generators of generalized Reed-Muller codes," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 46, no. 6, pp. 2152–2158, Sept. 2000.

[7] G. van der Geer and M. van der Vlugt, "Generalized Reed-Muller codes and curves with many points, *Journal of Number Theory*, vol. 72, pp. 257268, 1998.

[8] C. R. P. Hartmann and K. K. Tzeng, "Generalizations of the BCH bound, *Inform. and Control*, vol. 20, pp. 489–498, 1972.

[9] T. Kasami, S. Lin, W. Peterson, "Some results on cyclic codes which are invariant under the affine group and their applications," *Inform. and Control*, vol. 11, pp. 475–496, 1968.

[10] J. L. Massey, "Reversible codes," *Information and Control*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 369–380, 1964.

[11] J. L. Massey, "Linear codes with complementary duals," *Discrete Math.*, vol. 106/107, pp. 337–342, 1992.

[12] W. C. Huffman and V. Pless, *Fundamentals of Error-Correcting Codes*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.

[13] D. E. Muller, "Application of boolean algebra to switching circuit design and to error detection, *IEEE Trans. Computers*, vol. 3, pp. 6–12, 1954.

[14] I. S. Reed, "A class of multiple-error-correcting codes and the decoding scheme, *IRE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 4, pp. 38–49, 1954.

[15] N. Sendrier, "Linear codes with complementary duals meet the Gilbert-Varshamov bound," *Discrete Mathematics*, vol. 285, pp. 345–347, 2004.

[16] S. Yekhanin, "Locally decodable codes: a brief survey," In: Chee et al. (Eds.), *Coding and Cryptography*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 6639, pp. 273–282, 2011, Springer Verlag.